



Mrs June-Marie Hamilton
Crimsham Manor
Lagness
Chichester
PO20 1LN

Planning department Arun District Council,
Case officer Mr D. Innes
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
Sussex
BN17 5LF

Dear Mr Innes,

Objection to planning application P/140/16/OUT

I am writing to register my utter dismay and my incredulous objection at the proposed planning application for Pagham Road, reference number P/140/16/OUT, which frankly, beggars belief.

1. The proposed development is completely unsustainable and, if allowed to proceed, will be seriously damaging both environmentally and economically to all the surrounding areas.
2. Additionally, I would also wish to point out that the outstanding natural beauty of the area has already been seriously damaged by over-development and if nothing is done to stop it, this will continue apace until local children are growing up never having seen a farmer's field or a meadow of wild flowers, never having rolled in long grass or chased a butterfly.
3. The area is already dreadfully over-developed and overcrowded. And the application represents yet another dilution of the "strategic gaps" between local villages, hamlets and the City, which local residents have long been promised would remain - so as to avoid the whole area degenerating into a single patch of urban sprawl. It will also ruin the view of many local residents, who bought properties in the countryside, and paid council tax based on that amenity.
4. Crimsham Manor, our Grade II listed home, (built in 1700) has suffered repeated serious flooding following the diversion of the river Lavant - and the continuous addition of unsustainable property developments upstream of us, which have destroyed so much natural drainage. The family home which we first occupied in 1995 has been repeatedly flooded since the West Sussex County Council's intervention with a so-called flood protection scheme. This has been exacerbated by many new developments in the immediate area that were sanctioned without the provision for the necessary compensatory drainage, as required by common sense.
5. The damage to our property and the many other properties on Chichester plain, as a result of actions taken by the West Sussex County Council, are the unintended consequences of misguided policies perpetrated by the Council, when they chose to ignore all professional advice and decide on a cheaper option than the one that was recommended by the experts. I.e. proposal B rather than the more expensive proposal A.

6. To salvage the problem and continue our residence in the local area, without losing a fortune in the process, I was obliged to purchase the adjoining barn, in which we now (still) live, and this is marginally higher on the water table than the old house, however still subject to flooding and other drainage/sewerage problems.
7. Before the diversion of Chichester's flood-water into the Pagham Rife and other areas on Chichester Plain, there was no history of serious flooding of the area generally or of my property whatsoever, as confirmed by the four previous owners.
8. The sole cause of all the local flooding from the late 1990's onwards, was this diversion of this water in response to flooding in the city of Chichester, but exacerbated by gross over-development and mismanagement of a flood plain which was always unsuited to such developments. Since then, there has been regular flash flooding in the local fields and roads, causing yet more disruption and the water table has risen dramatically and we, (like many other local property owners), now suffer from the ingress of water from *beneath* the buildings as well as all the surface flooding).
9. This, and other similar flood damage are the unintended consequences of saving the city from flooding, but taking the cheapest option to do so, instead of the recommended option which would have sent all this flood water into the sea. The damage to my property is deemed to be incurable, except by "tanking" which is a very expensive process. We have had a quotation for £1.2 million to deal with the problem at our property alone - from experts in the field.
10. It was after a meeting with a local Geologist that I first came to understand the fuller and more detailed reasons for continued flooding in the area - and the continuing unstoppable water damage to my home. My family home and those of some of my neighbours were built on chalk, as are large areas of Chichester Plain, with only a very thin layer of covering clay. This causes not only surface flooding but water underneath being forced up through the floors because the chalk aquifers become completely waterlogged and apply upwards pressure wherever there is extreme pressure on the local drainage system, water coming down from the Downs, and fluvial flooding in addition. This is causing more damage to my home as I write, and the chalk can be clearly seen coming up through the flooring. I cannot take measures to repair my home until an extensive and costly drainage system has been put in place which at this moment in time I am not in the position to do, so alas my home stays empty while I pay for another, and my family's life is destroyed.
11. The pressure needs to be removed from the aquifers, so that I (and many others) can excavate floors, concrete, waterproof, and repair the subsidence, long before anything can be done to restore the interior.
12. If Arun District Council continues to authorize these huge developments on already waterlogged flood plains (which instead, should be preserved in order to protect the *existing* homes), then the flooding will only become more frequent and the damage to many existing homes will become completely irreversible.
13. Heaven only knows how the new ones will end up, built as most of them will be, at a price designed to optimise the profit to the developers, so they may not be good enough to sell well.
14. The economic impact of such a huge number of houses and increase in population will mean increased pressures on the already full doctors, dentists and hospitals. Residents who have lived here all their lives are *already* struggling to find appointments, so how are new

residents going to be able to access these resources, with ever increasing demand on these facilities? What **evidence** does the Council have of the measures set out to deal with this problem?

15. Education will also be at risk because even if new primary schools are built, there are simply not enough secondary schools to meet current population levels. Overcrowded secondary schools in the area are already struggling to keep up the standards expected by Ofsted. With more pupils comes more pressure which means the schools will not be good enough for existing children currently living in the area making their way through the education system.
16. The traffic that builds up along my road on a normal day (assuming the roads are not closed due to flooding – which is often the case), is bumper to bumper and crawling along (at no more than 10 m.p.h) between 6.30am-9am and 5pm-7.30pm. It disrupts my family's lives and access to our home. Any further rise in population brought on by the newly proposed developments will bring huge additional traffic delays and more pollution to the whole area.
17. This will adversely affect the ability of local residents to get to and from their place of work in a timely manner and live their lives without further undue stress.
18. To permit the additional removal of many, many acres of natural countryside drainage, to be replaced by concrete roads, driveways, pavements, etc. for housing schemes that are themselves too low lying to have mains drains and which are proposed to be built on flood plains, would be an act of wanton political vandalism
19. The proposed position of this (and other) new developments all of which lie close to the farthest boundaries of the empowered Council, means that facilities needed by new residents are likely to have to be met by the neighbouring Council who did not give their consent, but whose budget will be required to deal with many of the consequences.
20. Anyone who lives within the Arun District Council boundary but on the outskirts of Chichester and who has a complaint or dispute to raise with Arun will have noticed how hard it is to get any involvement/enforcement attendance from the Officers of Arun District Council in Littlehampton – probably because it is a good hour's drive away. Those who work for the Council are just not familiar with the area. Call me cynical if you like, but with not just one, not two, but three completely inappropriate development applications under consideration, it seems very strange that all three of them are planned for the very outside perimeter of the Arun area, on a flood plain, and where almost all the vital services will be provided from over the border by Chichester District Council, and at their cost and therefore the cost of the taxpayers within that neighbouring area.
21. For example, a secondary school pupil living in Pagham is not going to attend school in Littlehampton. He or she is most likely to attend school in Chichester. So Arun gets credit for housing and takes all the council tax, but Chichester or West Sussex may get to pay the bills for education. It is too often assumed that the practical needs of an increased population will be paid by the adjoining Council instead of the Council authorising the planning permission. Similarly, when the Fire Service is required for flooding assistance, in Pagham and the environs (including my house), it will not be the Littlehampton Fire Service that comes to our rescue – it will be Chichester. There are many such examples. The first time I was flooded I asked Arun District Council for assistance with sandbags, they said it was too far for them to come, and anyway they had run out. They told me to phone Chichester instead, which I did and they kindly delivered some.

22. Whilst such politics are being played between adjoining managing Councils, the residents involved are suffering and it is patently unfair for one Council to impose costs and strains on a neighbouring Council. I do hope that someone has warned the Chichester Fire Services of the obvious consequences of such additional developments – both in respect of Fire and Flood.
23. According to official information, there is an accepted need for 129 new homes – there is absolutely no recognised requirement for nearly 1,000 new homes to be built on an already saturated and mis-managed flood plain. There is plenty of scope for 129 new homes to be built on brownfield sites on areas other than a flood plain.

ANY new developments **AT ALL** on Chichester Plain will be utterly disastrous to the area and will only serve to make richer some unscrupulous developers, (and to provide ticks in the box for Arun). **The residents who are already established in the area deserve the first loyalty and protection of Arun District Council, not the developers.**

This application, which can only cause additional damage to a previously much undamaged area should be met with a unanimous and absolute resounding “NO”, as should the other two, for which separate objections have been raised.

Furthermore, until all current flooding problems have been 100% resolved, there should be an absolute moratorium on building any further housing developments, anywhere on Chichester Plain. And the developers should be so informed so that we can all begin to sleep at night again.

I hope that the District Council will consider each of the numbered points that I have made and discuss them with real intellectual honesty and integrity.



June Hamilton (Mrs)